APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,474	07/11/2001	Norman Wesley Gimbert	13DV-14215	9339

7590 08/13/2008

John S. Beulick
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
One metropolitan Sq., Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER
ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/903,474	GIMBERT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neveen Abel-Jalil	2165	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 July 2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
  closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11,13,14 and 16-18</u> is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11, 13-14, and 16-18</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
    application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail. Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   In response to Applicant's Amendment filed on July 22, 2008, claims 1-11, 13, 14 and

16-18 are pending.

2.   Applicant's amendment has overcome the previously presented claim objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-10, 13-14, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hobbs (U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 B1) in view of Dan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,639 B1),

and further in view of Garrow et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0194160 A1).

        As to claim 1, Hobbs discloses a method for communicating information between

business entities in a collaborative development using a system including a first server system

controlled and operated by a first business entity and a second server system operated by a

second business entity, the first server system including a first web server hosting a website of

the first business entity and a first database including data owned by the first business entity, the

second server system including a second web server hosting a website of the second business

entity and a second database including data owned by the second business entity, said method

comprising the steps of:

coupling the first web server to the first database controlled by the first business entity,

wherein the first web server populates a first web site with data from the first database such that

the first web site has a navigational structure (See <u>Hobbs</u> Figure 12, and see <u>Hobbs</u> Figure 13,

Site Plan), the data including information that the first business entity wants to share with the

second business entity (See <u>Hobbs</u> column 14, lines 50-65, wherein "first server system" deemed

to include the original Web site of the business –i.e. "E&Y, Lexis/Nexis");

coupling the second web server to the second database controlled by the second business

entity, wherein the second web server populates a second web site with data from the second

database, the data including information that the second business entity wants to share with the

first business entity (See <u>Hobbs</u> column 25, lines 29-35, and <u>Hobbs</u> column 28, lines 44-60, also

see <u>Hobbs</u> column 14, lines 50-65, wherein "second server system" deemed to include the

"warehouse system");

synchronizing the first web site and the second web site to function together as a

collaborative web site wherein at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative website

is hosted from the first website by the first business entity and at least a portion of the data

included in the collaborative website is hosted from the second website by the second business

entity wherein the collaborative web site is hosted jointly by the first and second business entity

(See <u>Hobbs</u> column 3, lines 50-52, prior art., also see <u>Hobbs</u> column 7, lines 19-29, and see

<u>Hobbs</u> column 10, lines 13-27); and

accessing the first web site and the data stored in the first server system database by a

user associated with the second business entity via the collaborative website (See Hobbs column

25, lines 11-20);

accessing the second web site and the data stored in the second server system database by

a user associated with the first business entity to select a link displayed on the collaborative

website (See Hobbs column 25, lines 11-20, also see Hobbs Figure 6).

Hobbs does not explicitly teach such that the second web site has a navigational structure

substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure. Hobbs teaches site plan and site

index which are navigational structures of a website in Figures 12 and 13. Navigational pages are

merely the order of and composition of a website and thus inherent to all web sites. Hobbs also

teaches populating the collaborative website from various sources including many databases.

Dan et al. teaches such that the second web site has a navigational structure substantially

identical to the first web site navigation structure (See Dan et al. column 4, lines 47-51, wherein

a single website is cloned thus having identical navigation structure at point in time and at

remote location if implemented as such).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have modified Hobbs by the teaching of Dan et al. to include such that the second

web site has a navigational structure substantially identical to the first web site navigation

structure by cloning a website navigational structure and populating it with different data than

the original website site as taught by the combined references because it makes it easier to

identify and combine similar structures thus keeping better management and control of websites.

Hobbs as modified still does not teach recording navigation change details, including a url of the page changed, and a controlling party of the page in a historical log.

Dan et al. teaches recording navigation change details, including a url of the page changed, and a controlling party of the page in a historical log (See Dan et al. column 4, lines 18-20, and see Dan et al. column 3, lines 13-19, also see Dan et al. abstract, also see Dan et al. Figure 3, S40, and see Dan et al. column 10, lines 5-10, wherein it is inherent that web pages are identified by urls, and wherein "controlling party" reads on "owner/user" who has access rights and made the changes).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Dan et al. to include recording navigation change details, including a url of the page changed, and a controlling party of the page in a historical log because it is well known in the art to utilize log to account for changes including identifiers and user who made the changes for efficient tracking and management.

Hobbs as modified still does not teach aircraft and aircraft engine information.

Garrow et al. teaches aircraft and aircraft engine information (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Garrow et al. to include aircraft and aircraft engine information because providing specific records dealing with one

industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business

costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claim 2, <u>Hobbs</u> as modified discloses wherein said step of coupling the first web

server to the first database further comprises the step of providing a first server system (See

<u>Hobbs</u> column 11, lines 63-67, also see <u>Hobbs</u> column 14, lines 45-59) hosted by an aircraft

engine manufacturer (See <u>Garrow et al.</u> page 6, paragraph 0058, also see <u>Garrow et al.</u> column 9,

lines 47-67, also see <u>Garrow et al.</u> page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

As to claim 3, <u>Hobbs</u> as modified discloses wherein said step of coupling the second web

server to the second database further comprises the step of providing a second server system

hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer (See <u>Garrow et al.</u> page 6, paragraph 0058, also see

<u>Garrow et al.</u> column 9, lines 47-67, also see <u>Garrow et al.</u> page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

As to claim 4, <u>Hobbs</u> as modified discloses wherein said step of accessing the first web

site and the data stored in the first server system further comprises the step of accessing data

from the first and second server systems based on individual access privileges (See <u>Hobbs</u>

column 11, lines 63-67, also see <u>Hobbs</u> column 14, lines 45-59).

As to claim 5, <u>Hobbs</u> as modified discloses wherein said step of accessing data stored in

the first server system further comprises the step of selectively accessing (See <u>Hobbs</u> column 11,

lines 63-67, also see <u>Hobbs</u> column 14, lines 45-59) at least one of aircraft engine and aircraft

data relating to at least one of general information data, plans and schedules data, propulsion

systems data, and engineering data (See <u>Garrow et al.</u> column 9, lines 47-67, also see <u>Garrow et</u>

<u>al.</u> page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

As to claim 6, <u>Hobbs</u> discloses a system of communicating information to a user via a

computer including a browser, said system comprising:

a first server system controlled and operated by a first business entity comprising a first

web server and a first database including data owned by the first business entity, said first web

server coupled to said first database and to said network, said first web server displays a first web

site populated with data from said first database at the user computer such that the fist web site

has a navigational structure (See <u>Hobbs</u> Figure 12, and see <u>Hobbs</u> Figure 13, Site Plan); and

a second server system controlled and operated by a second business entity comprising a

second web server and a second database including data owned by the second business entity,

said second web server coupled to said second database and to said network, said second web

server displays at user computer a second web site populated with data from said second

database, said first web site and said second web site synchronized to function together as a

collaborative web site wherein at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative website

is hosted from the first website by the first business entity and at least a portion of the data

included in the collaborative website is hosted from the second website by the second business

entity wherein the collaborative web site is hosted jointly by the first and second business entity,

and the data stored in said first server system database is accessible to a user browser via said

second server system, and the data stored in said second server system database is accessible to

the user browser via said first server system, and the collaborative website is displayed to the

user enabling the user to access data stored in at least one of said first and second server system

(See Hobbs column 25, lines 29-35, and Hobbs column 28, lines 44-60, also see Hobbs column

14, lines 50-65, wherein "second server system" deemed to include the "warehouse system").

　　Hobbs does not explicitly teach navigational pages such that the second web site has a

navigational structure substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure. Hobbs

teaches site plan and site index which are navigational structures of a website in Figures 12 and

13. Navigational pages are merely the order of and composition of a website and thus inherent to

all web sites. Hobbs also teaches populating the collaborative website from various sources

including many databases.

　　Dan et al. teaches such that the second web site has a navigational structure substantially

identical to the first web site navigation structure (See Dan et al. column 4, lines 47-51, wherein

a single website is cloned thus having identical navigation structure at point in time and at

remote location if implemented as such).

　　It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have modified Hobbs by the teaching of Dan et al. to include such that the second

web site has a navigational structure substantially identical to the first web site navigation

structure by cloning a website navigational structure and populating it with different data than

the original website site as taught by the combined references because it makes it easier to

identify and combine similar structures thus keeping better management and control of websites.

　　Hobbs as modified still does not teach at least one of said first database and said second

database maintains a record of navigational structure changes in a spreadsheet format.

Dan et al. teaches at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes in a database (See Dan et al. column 4, lines 18-20, and see Dan et al. column 3, lines 13-19, also see Dan et al. abstract, also see Dan et al. Figure 3, S40, wherein a database provides a log and wherein spreadsheet format of log is well known in the art).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Dan et al. to include recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a database because it is well known in the art to store data in various formats within a database and those types of format are obvious to include spreadsheet program which was well known at the time the invention was made for customization and efficiency.

Hobbs as modified still does not teach aircraft and aircraft engine information.

Garrow et al. teaches aircraft and aircraft engine information (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Garrow et al. to include aircraft and aircraft engine information because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claim 7, <u>Hobbs</u> as modified discloses wherein said data stored in said first server system and said second server system accessible to the user browser based on individual access privileges (See <u>Hobbs</u> column 10, lines 25-27).

As to claim 8, <u>Hobbs</u> as modified discloses said first server system, said second server system hosted by a business partner (See <u>Hobbs</u> column 35, lines 27-35, wherein "partner" reads on "sponsor").

<u>Hobbs</u> as modified still does not teach hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer.

<u>Garrow et al.</u> teaches hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer (See <u>Garrow et al.</u> page 6, paragraph 0058, also see <u>Garrow et al.</u> page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified <u>Hobbs</u> as modified by the teaching of <u>Garrow et al.</u> to include hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claims 9, and 10, <u>Hobbs</u> as modified discloses wherein at least one of said first database and said second (See <u>Hobbs</u> column 25, lines 12-17).

<u>Hobbs</u> as modified still does not teach database includes aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data, propulsion systems data, and engineering.

Garrow et al. teaches database includes aircraft engine data relating to at least one of

general information data, propulsion systems data, and engineering (See Garrow et al. column 9,

lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Garrow et al. to include

hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer; hosted by a business partner of the aircraft engine

manufacturer; and at least one of plans and schedules, propulsion systems, and engineering

because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective

tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claim 13, Hobbs discloses a web-based communications system comprising:

a computer comprising a browser;

a network coupled to said computer (See Hobbs Figure 4, shows a networked computer

with a browser);

a first server system controlled and operated (by a business) comprising a first web server

and a first database, said first web server coupled to said first database and to said network, said

first web server configured to display at said computer a first web site having navigation al

structure (See Hobbs Figure 12, and see Hobbs Figure 13, Site Plan) and populated with data

from said first database (See Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65, wherein "first server system"

deemed to include the original Web site of the business –i.e. "E&Y, Lexis/Nexis"); and

a second server system controlled and operated (by a second business) comprising a

second web server and a second database, said second web server coupled to said second

database and to said network, said second web server configured to display at said computer a second web site populated with data from said second database (See Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65, wherein "second server system" deemed to include the "warehouse system"); wherein said system is configured to:

synchronize said first web site and said second web site such that said first web site and said second web site function together as a collaborative web site wherein at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from said first website and at least a portion of said data included in said collaborative website is hosted from said second website, and wherein said collaborative web site is hosted jointly by the first and second business entity, and the data stored in said first server system database is accessible to a user browser via said second server system, and the data stored in said second server system database is accessible to said user browser via said first server system and the collaborative website displayed to the user for accessing data stored in at least one of said first and second server system; and transmit information from said browser to at least one of said first server system and a second server system (See Hobbs column 3, lines 50-52, prior art., also see Hobbs column 7, lines 19-29, also see Hobbs column 9, lines 8-25, wherein "first system" and "second system" reads on "first network source" and "second network source", and see Hobbs column 10, lines 20-27, wherein the claimed term "for accessing" is interpreted as intended use, and should be replaced with "to access").

Hobbs does not teach at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes in a spreadsheet format.

Dan et al. teaches at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a

record of navigation changes entered by a user in a spreadsheet format (See Dan et al. column 4,

lines 18-20, and see Dan et al. column 3, lines 13-19, also see Dan et al. abstract, also see Dan et

al. Figure 3, S40, wherein a database provides a log and wherein spreadsheet format of log is

well known in the art).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have modified Hobbs by the teaching of Dan et al. to include recording changes in

the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a spreadsheet format because it is

well known in the art to utilize various applications including spreadsheets to store website log

data.

Hobbs as modified still does not teach the business being an aircraft engine manufacturer

and second business being a partner of the aircraft manufacturer.

Garrow et al. teaches the business being an aircraft engine manufacturer and second

business being a partner of the aircraft manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058,

also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-

0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Garrow et al. to include

hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer or a partner of the aircraft manufacturer because

providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking

of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

Hobbs as modified still does not explicitly teach such that the second web site has a navigational structure substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure. Hobbs teaches site plan and site index which are navigational structures of a website in Figures 12 and 13 (i.e. site map). Navigational pages are merely the order of and composition of a website and thus inherent to all web sites. Hobbs also teaches populating the collaborative website from various sources including many databases.

Dan et al. teaches such that the second web site has a navigational structure substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure (See Dan et al. column 4, lines 47-51, wherein a single website is cloned thus having identical navigation structure at point in time and at remote location if implemented as such).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Dan et al. to include such that the second web site has a navigational structure substantially identical to the first web site navigation structure by cloning a website navigational structure and populating it with different data than the original website site as taught by the combined references because it makes it easier to identify and combine similar structures thus keeping better management and control of websites.

As to claim 14, Hobbs as modified discloses said first server system hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer, said second server system hosted by an aircraft manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071, wherein "turbine engine" reads on "jet engine").

As to claims 16, and 18, <u>Hobbs</u> as modified discloses wherein said browser configured to display aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data, plans and schedules data, propulsion systems data, and engineering data (See <u>Garrow et al.</u> column 9, lines 47-67, also see <u>Garrow et al.</u> page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

5.   Claims 11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Hobbs</u> (U.S. Patent 6,523,022 B1) in view of <u>Dan et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,639 B1), and in view of well known teachings in the art, further in view of <u>Garrow et al.</u> (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0194160 A1) and still further in view of <u>Glass et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,965).

As to claim 11 <u>Hobbs</u> as modified teaches said first database and said second database (See <u>Hobbs</u> column 2, lines 47-51).

<u>Hobbs</u> as modified still does not teach wherein at least one of said database maintains a record of navigation changes.

<u>Glass et al.</u> teaches wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes (See <u>Glass et al.</u> column 5, lines 34-51, wherein "maintains a record" reads on "flight history", also see <u>Glass et al.</u> column 22, lines 38-63, wherein "navigational changes" reads on "flight plans").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified <u>Hobbs</u> as modified by the teaching of <u>Glass et al.</u> to include wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of

navigation changes because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient

information retrieval and processing.

As to claim 17, <u>Hobbs</u> as modified still does not teach wherein said browser configured

to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said user interface.

Glass et al. teaches wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical

log (See <u>Glass et al.</u> column 5, lines 41-48) relating to navigational changes (See <u>Glass et al.</u>

column 5, lines 34-51, wherein "maintains a record" reads on "flight history", also see <u>Glass et</u>

<u>al.</u> column 22, lines 38-63, wherein "navigational changes" reads on "flight plans") to said user

interface (See <u>Glass et al.</u> column 11, lines 12-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have further modified <u>Hobbs</u> as modified by the teaching of <u>Glass et al.</u> to include

wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational

changes to said user interface because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing

efficient information retrieval and processing.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed on July 22, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that "<u>Hobbs</u> does not describe nor suggest a system

configured to synchronize a first web site and a second web site such that the first web site and

the second web site function together as a collaborative web site, wherein a portion of the

navigational pages accessible in the collaborative web site is hosted from said first web site by a

first business entity and a portion of the navigational pages accessible in the collaborative web

site is hosted from said second web site by a second business entity, and wherein the

collaborative web site is hosted jointly by said first and second business entities" is

acknowledged but not deemed to be persuasive.

Although addressed before in prior office actions, it is still not found to be persuasive.

The Applicant has offered neither explanation nor details in the claims as what differentiates the

claimed subject matter from Hobbs' system. The Applicant appears to mischaracterize Hobbs'

invention since clearly in various sections, and more especially in column 14, lines 45-67, and

Figure 3, Hobbs teaches correlating various searchable content from remote sources (content

databases coupled to servers) through a central GUI (i.e. warehouse GUI).

Applicant continues to argue on page 14 that "nowhere does Hobbs mentions

synchronizations between websites to function as collaborative web site" which is not found to

be persuasive.

It is respectfully noted that applicant's specification does not offer any description of said

"synchronization" beyond what is found in the published version paragraph 0016:

> [0016] System 7, enables the first and second businesses to communicate and collaborate in a centralized,
> paperless environment. However, because each business entity hosts their own data on their own server and sub-
> system, proprietary data integrity and control is maintained. System 7 operates by creating two independently hosted
> web sites (not shown in FIG. 1) that are synchronized to function as a collaborative web site. More specifically,
> system 7 coordinates the content and navigation on each business entity's server. Accordingly, the business entities
> agree to a common navigation structure and to common content upload rules. Furthermore, the business entities
> agreed to a common platform for maintaining user permissions across the web sites to ensure that users from each
> business entity have equal functionality within system 7.

Which in fact leaves the claims open to the broadest reasonable interpretation and offers

structure that is not claimed that appears to be essential to the invention "creating two

independently hosted web sites" within a centralized single system. In view of the above, Hobbs'

invention as whole is directed to solving what the prior art that lacks, a GUI that correlates and

synchronizes the records of multiple databases

Applicant further argues that "Hobbs scheme allows for user access on only one system

in contrast to the claimed access by a second entity" not deemed to be persuasive,

Not only is unclear what is meant by the argument, the claims do not offer any

specialized means describing said access, and since it is inherent in the art that Web sites and

pages over the Internet as the ones taught by Hobbs, are public and therefore accessible by many

entities. More so, Hobbs explicitly states the sources of content are exiting well known business

entities (i.e. with their respective established Web sites).

As previously stated the combination of Hobbs and references cited in the office action

teach GUI (204) correlating and synchronizing the records of multiple databases (i.e. shared

collaborative portal) wherein each database is connected through an application server (each with

its own database server) that is operated and controlled by a separate business entity, see Hobbs

column 16, lines 63-66, and see Hobbs column 17, lines 4-11, and Hobbs column 28, lines 45-

55. Hobbs, in general, teaches a subscription-based portal displaying links of information once

selected provides access to separate remote databases to retrieved actual data; thus reading on the

argued limitaion. There does not appear to be any further distinction made in the claims to the

contrary.

In response to applicant's argument that "Dan does not describe nor suggest a system configured to synchronize a first web site and a second web site such that the first web site and the second web site function together as a collaborative web site, wherein a portion of the navigational pages accessible in the collaborative web site is hosted from said first web site by a first business entity and a portion of the navigational pages accessible in the collaborative web site is hosted from said second web site by a second business entity, and wherein the collaborative web site is hosted jointly by said first and second business entities" is acknowledged but not deemed to be persuasive.

As addressed above Hobbs teaches the feature of combined sources of information to be accessed through one centralized website (i.e. collaborative). While, Dan was introduced to teach navigational structure changes as well as maintaining the changes in a database.

Applicant's argument on the bottom of page 10 that "No combination of Hobbs nor Dan describes nor suggest a system of communicating aircraft and aircraft engine information between business entities in a collaborative development" as recited in claim 6" is not deemed to be persuasive.

The Examiner contents under the new rejection further in view of Garrow et al. the recitation is met as disclosed in Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071.

Applicant appears to argue in multiple sections of the remarks that "Hobbs does not teach

or suggest a second database and a second server" is respectfully noted but not found to be

persuasive.

Hobbs as conceded by Applicant's remarks on pages 11 and 17, second paragraph, does

indeed describe populating website form different databases and explicitly teaches one database

is connected to a server (See column 16, lines 7-11). As explained in the office action above,

such implementation is certainly modifiable by one of ordinary skill in the art to include yet

another server (second server) connected to one of the many databases disclosed by Hobbs.

In column 11, lines 40-53, Hobbs teaches his centralized collaborative system to include

connections and information collections from/to multiple servers:

The hypertext links in the information template contain the HTTP or other network protocol addresses to a
second HTTP server on a computer network. The second Server acts as an application proxy server (the
"Application Server") to both the client application and a third HTTP server on a computer network connected
through a database interface application running on a server to a Data Warehouse or database containing multimedia
information searchable by the database's or Data Warehouse's proprietary search engine (the "Database Server").
When a user clicks on the hyperlinks appearing in the window of the browser, he or she will be in simultaneous
interactive communication with both the Application Server and the Database Server across the network.

And see column 15, lines 58-67:

Application Server 207 is coupled to a Database Server 211 by connection 208. Application Server 207 and
Database Server 211 interactively communicate with each other using the functionality provided on connection 208
by the Common Gateway Interface (CGI) and HTTP via connection 208. The Document Server 202, Application
Server 207 and Database Server 211 are typical HTTP servers equipped with varying degrees of memory and hard
drive space.

Indeed connections to various content databases and centralizing their access through the

warehouse of Hobbs does read on the claims. There is no recitations in the claims as to

describing the first and second server as "document servers" as argued on page 17.

The remaining pages of arguments in the remarks appear to be directed to ones similar to what is addressed above.

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian P. Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Neveen Abel-Jalil
August 8, 2008

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2165